REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 12, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1-25 have been rejected. Claims 1, 15 and 25 are independent claims from which claims 2-14 and 16-24 respectively depend. Claims 1, 15 and 25 have been amended.

While Applicants do not agree with the grounds for rejection, in the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended the independent claims to more particularly point out the invention, which renders the stated grounds for rejection moot. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, define over the prior art. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found in the application as originally filed in paragraphs 0006, 0018, in Figure 5 and elsewhere.

§102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9-14 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Lomet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,086). It is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable because Lomet does not disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' amended claims. Hence, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 102 rejection of these claims.

Claims 15, 22 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Shoaib et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,180). It is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable because Shoaib does not disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' amended claims. Shoaib is directed to a messaging system that is configurable by a set of input parameters. Shoaib does not disclose or suggest at least a contract between the calling component and the called component that requires the called component to guarantee persistence of its last return message to the calling component module until released by receiving a second message from the calling component, as recited by Applicants' amended claim 15, from which claims 22 and 23 depend. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable and request the withdrawal of the 102 rejection of these claims.

§103(a) Rejections

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2756/302351.01
Application No.: 10/720,622
Office Action Dated: January 12, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

Claims 2 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lomet in view of Britton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,136). Applicants respectfully submit these claims are patentable because neither Lomet nor Britton, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all the unobvious features of Applicants' claims. Britton is directed to a messaging system in which messages stored in a persistent queue at the source are associated with a sequence identifier that identifies the message stored in the source persistent queue. When the message with its sequence identifier is received at the destination, it is stored in the destination persistent queue. Britton does not disclose or suggest at least a contract between the calling component and the called component that requires the called component to guarantee persistence of its last return message to the calling component module until released by receiving a second message from the calling component as recited by Applicants' amended claim 1 from which these claims depend. As neither Lomet nor Britton, alone or in combination disclose or suggest all the novel features of Applicants' claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of these claims.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lomet in view of Ganesh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,223). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is patentable because neither Lomet nor Ganesh, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all the unobvious features of Applicants' claims. Ganesh is directed to a two-phase commit mechanism where to determine whether a particular participating database system is prepared to commit, the coordinating database system examines external log tracking data residing on the database system. Ganesh does not disclose or suggest at least a contract between the calling component and the called component that requires the called component to guarantee persistence of its last return message to the calling component module until released by receiving a second message from the calling component as recited by Applicants' amended claim 1, from which this claim depends. As neither Lomet nor Ganesh, alone or in combination disclose or suggest all the novel features of Applicants' claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is allowable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejection of this claim.

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoaib in view of Ganesh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,136). Applicants respectfully submit

that claim 21 is patentable because, as described above, neither Shoaib nor Ganesh, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least a contract between the calling component and the called component that requires the called component to guarantee persistence of its last return message to the calling component module until released by receiving a second message from the calling component as recited by Applicants' amended claim 15, from which this claim depends. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is allowable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejection of this claim.

Claims 16-20 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoaib in view of Britton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,136). Applicants respectfully submit these claims are patentable because neither Shoaib nor Britton, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all the unobvious features of Applicants' amended claim 15, from which these claims depend, as described above. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of these claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and an early allowance is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel it would be helpful, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (215) 564-8270.

Date: March 9, 2007   /Susan C. Murphy/
                                                 Susan C. Murphy
                                                 Registration No. 46,221

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439